REMARKS

All outstanding requirements will now be addressed in the order they appear in the Office Action mailed August 13, 2007.

Claim objections

3. Claim 1 stands objected to because of a number of informalities. Applicants have amended claim 1 as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this objection with respect to claim 1 as amended.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

4-5. Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants have made appropriate corrections to claim 1 as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection with respect to claim 1 as amended.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

6. Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 11, 14-19, and 21-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Regula (US Pat No. 6,885,670 B1).

Applicants have amended claim 1 by adding the feature "the input rules, the output rules and the general rules define unit-processing commands", which has support in the description of Fig. 1 and pages 10-11 of the specification (exemplary commands and their arguments).

According to the Office Action of August 13, 2007 (page 6, lines 1-2), Regula allegedly recites that "each of the nodes is assigned input and output rules as well as general rules (R)" as Addressing Rules and Routing Decision Rules (col. 19 line 44 and col. 20 line 14). Further, it is alleged (page 6, lines 2-16) that Regula recites "whenever a packet is available at the node input (PROC1-POROCn, MUX1-MUXo, OUT1-OUTn) a check is

made whether the general rules apply to a given unit, and in case of a positive result of this check, the commands, determined by these rules, are executed, and then a check is made whether the input rules of the given node apply to a given unit and if they do, the commands, determined by these rules, are executed" as Header Error Check (col. 33 line 42) and initiation cell errors (other than header errors).

Applicants respectfully disagree. The Addressing Rules and Routing Decision Rules as disclosed by Regula (corresponding to the general rules and input rules, respectively, of the present invention) do not include Header Error Check and initiation cell errors. Therefore, the step of checking Header Error Check and initiation cell errors as disclosed by Regula cannot and does not correspond to the step of checking general rules and input rules of the method of the present invention.

Moreover, the Addressing Rules do not define unit-processing commands to be executed at each node, as defined by the currently amended claim 1, but simply a scheme of packet addressing. Therefore, the Addressing Rules as disclosed by Regula do not correspond to the general rules of the present invention.

Moreover, Regula does not indicate that the commands defined by the Routing Decision Rules are performed after performing node functions. Therefore, the Routing Decision Rules do not correspond to the output rules of the present invention. Therefore, Regula does not disclose any output rules assigned to nodes.

It follows that the method of data flow control as disclosed by Regula includes only node input rules (Routing Decision Rules), and not general rules, which are to be executed at any node before node input rules, nor output rules, which are to be executed at any node after executing node functions. Thus, the currently amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Regula.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection with respect to claim 1 as amended and to claims 2-3, 5, 7, 9, 11 and 15-23 as previously presented, in view of the amendments and arguments presented above.

In addition, Applicants have amended claim 14 by adding the feature "unit-processing functions", which has support in the description of Fig. 1 and pages 10-11 of the description (exemplary commands and their arguments).

According to the Office Action of August 13, 2007 (page 10, line 20 – page 11, line 4), Regula allegedly recites that "assigning rules to each node, the rules defining additional functions to be performed by the node and being one of general rules applying to all transmission units processed in the node ..." as Addressing Rules and Table 7 provides the rules for composing the routing tag's 729 address subfields (col. 19, lines 44-47). Applicants respectfully disagree. The Addressing Rules as disclosed by Regula are not assigned to each node.

Furthermore, according to the Office Action of August 13, 2007 (page 11, lines 9-12), Regula allegedly discloses that "processing data in each node by performing sequentially functions defined by general rules, functions defined by the input rules, the node functions and functions defined by the output rules" as Swallowing Decision, Forwarding Decision, and Capturing Decision (col. 20 line 62 to col. 21 line 29). Applicants respectfully disagree. The Swallowing Decision, Forwarding Decision and Capturing Decision are all defined by Routing Decision Rules, which correspond to node input rules of the present invention. Therefore, Regula discloses processing data in each node by performing functions defined by the input rules, but not by general rules or output rules.

Therefore, the method of data flow control as disclosed by Regula includes only node input rules (Routing Decision Rules), and not general rules, which are to be executed at any node before node input rules, nor output rules, which are to be executed at any node after executing node functions. Thus, the currently amended claim 14 is not anticipated by Regula.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection with respect to claim 14 as amended.

With respect to claim 24, according to the Office Action of August 13, 2007 (page 17, lines 7-16), Regula allegedly discloses that "wherein the input nodes, the intermediate nodes and the output nodes have assigned rules, the rules defining additional functions to be performed by the input nodes, the intermediate nodes and the output nodes and being one of

general rules applying to all transmission units processed in the node, input rules applying to transmission units incoming at a specific input of the node, and output rules applying to transmission units outgoing from a specific output of the node" as Addressing Rules and Table 7 provides the rules for composing the routing tag's 729 address subfields (col. 19, lines 44-47); and Routing Decision Rules and a link interface determines, for each cell it receives, whether to forward the cell, and whether to capture the cell. Applicants respectfully disagree. The Addressing Rules as disclosed by Regula are not assigned to each node. Furthermore, the Routing Decision Rules correspond at most to node input rules of the present invention.

Therefore, the device for data flow control as disclosed by Regula includes only node input rules (Routing Decision Rules) assigned to each node, but not general rules, assigned to each node and applying to all transmission units processed in each node, nor output rules, assigned to each node and applying to transmission units outgoing from a specific output of each node. Therefore, the currently amended claim 24 is not anticipated by Regula.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection with respect to claim 24 as amended and to claims 25-26 as previously presented, in view of the arguments and amendments presented above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully solicited. Should an extension of time be required, Applicants hereby petition for same and request that the extension fee and any other fee required for timely consideration of this submission be charged to **Deposit Account No. 503182**.

Customer Number: **33,794**   Respectfully Submitted,

/Matthias Scholl/

Dr. Matthias Scholl, Esq.
Reg. No. 54,947
Date: <u>December 10, 2007</u>   Attorney of Record